



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROFESSOR MCGIFFERT ON THE APOSTOLIC AGE.¹

By SHAILER MATHEWS,
The University of Chicago.

The appearance of this volume so shortly after that of Harnack's *Chronologie der Altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, and especially the similarity of the two in most important matters of chronology, will serve to deepen the interest aroused in the study of the apostolic age already awakened by that and other works, especially those of Weizsäcker and O. Holtzmann. It would, however, be unfair to Professor McGiffert were the similarities between his positions and those of his teacher (as he generously calls Harnack) to be interpreted as resulting from the devotion of a member to a master of a school. Professor McGiffert's positions are independently sustained, and, as the preface points out, in several vital matters he differs from Harnack. This independence of opinion, as well as the character of the volume in general, makes it, on the whole, the most notable addition to theological literature on the side of critical church history and New Testament criticism as yet made by any American. If, therefore, we feel obliged to differ with some of its main positions such dissent by no means should be interpreted as evincing a lack of appreciation of its method and spirit, or dissent from most of its conclusions.

1. The first matter for which the student of New Testament times looks in a work of this sort is the author's general critical position as regards Acts. No book of the New Testament has of late years received more attention as a possible key to a proper criticism of its period as a whole. And, indeed, any scientific historical work is impossible that is not based upon an examination of sources. Professor McGiffert has a critical theory as to Acts, which he uses constantly and consistently, but which is introduced incidentally in connection with the discussion of various incidents. It is not easy, therefore, to disentangle the criteria upon which it is based, or the theory

¹ *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*. By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D., Washburn Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary. (International Theological Library). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. Pp. xii + 681. \$2.50 net.

itself as a whole. Such a method has its advantages, but it sometimes leaves the reader without clear views as to the worth of the grounds upon which one element of a narrative is taken and another rejected, and often exposes the author to the charge of subjectivity. In certain portions of his work this suspicion is somewhat supported by the author's occasionally dismissing some element in his source with the bald statement that it is "improbable," or that it "could not" be true. In fact, although it is by no means true that Professor McGiffert is moved frequently by dogmatic reasons, it would be strange if in some instances such a charge were not brought against him simply from the lack of any comprehensive statement of his critical position as a whole.

So far as the composition of Acts is concerned, Professor McGiffert holds as follows: The book is made up from various sources, chief among which are the "we" sections. It is by no means clear that these are a part of a larger source that underlies the whole of Acts, or even of the second half. The sources of the earlier portion of the work are derived from primitive Christian documents, but in no place have the epistles of Paul been used. These sources have been freely reworked by the author of Acts, who has not hesitated to represent the organization of the primitive church as conforming to that of later days (pp. 44*n*, 92*n*, 97, 109, 255), or to misrepresent, perhaps through ignorance, other features of the early era of Christianity (pp. 52*n*, 74, 83*n*, 84*n*, 99, 100, 120, 255, 260*n*, 268, 274). But in such reworking the author is not moved by any desire to conciliate two wings of Christianity, as the Tübingen school claim (p. 430). His work is no mere aggregation of documents, but a unified and artistic history, intended to defend Christianity from persecution by showing it to have been regarded as harmless by Roman officials (pp. 346, 348).

As to the author and date of the book, Professor McGiffert is somewhat in doubt. Indeed, at times it seems as if his views had varied during the production of his work — a possibility perhaps explaining the difference of terminology and implications in different portions of the book. Thus it would appear from pages 47 and 95*n* as if the author of Acts presents a conception of the office of the apostles current in the second century, while on page 437 he is represented as most probably writing during the persecution of Domitian. Something like vagueness of terminology attaches to the name of the author himself. Although he is repeatedly spoken of as Luke, Professor McGiffert holds that he could not have been Luke, for Acts was not written by a disciple of Paul (p. 433). The reason for this view is that the author of

Acts could not have been the author of the "we" sections, as he is too ignorant of events in the primitive church, the life of Paul, and also of the doctrine of Paul (pp. 237, 462). It is at this point that Professor McGiffert's criticism is a trifle disappointing. The Lukan authorship of the work, as a whole, rises and falls with the relations of the "we" sections to the rest of the book. If evidence is at hand that the literary characteristics of their author are present throughout Acts, the conclusion is inevitable that he himself wrote, or at least edited, the book as a whole. If, in addition to such evidence, the omission of certain elements one might expect to be present can be reasonably explained by the general structure of the book, it is difficult to see why the traditional authorship should not be admitted. It is impossible here to present fully the grounds upon which it seems necessary to assent to each of these propositions, but they may be briefly stated as follows: (1) A minute study of the diction, as well as the grammatical structure and peculiarities of the narrative portions of Acts, shows an astonishing similarity between all sections of the book no matter what the apparent sources whence they are derived, and the "we" sections. (2) The same is true to a less degree of the speech material of Acts, it being also probable that if the writer composed the earlier speeches of Peter and Paul (as well as the first account of the latter's conversion) from older materials, he did it freely and with many of the literary peculiarities of the author of the "we" sections. (3) The Hebraisms or other local peculiarities, either in vocabulary or description, which occur in connection with these common characteristics, are most naturally explained as arising from the author's devotion to his sources — a trait also of the writer of the third gospel.

In a brief, the admitted unity of plan in Acts points to an author who handled all the material the book contains. The "we" sections are admittedly an original source. But their characteristics are to be found elsewhere in Acts, and in passages which seem distinctly the work of its author. Can it be possible that this author is a man who has so come under the influence of the "we" passages as to write in a style that is theirs? Is it not far more probable that he is himself the author of these sections?

Now Professor McGiffert expressly admits (p. 239 *n*) the "identity of diction between the 'we' passages and the other parts of the book, and the lack of any sign of a break between the former and their immediate context," while of the instances cited by him to prove Luke's ignorance of the latter part of Paul's career there is not one

that either cannot readily be explained by a reference to his general literary method and purpose, so well brought out by Professor Ramsay (and recognized by Professor McGiffert) or overcome by some chronological or critical position rejected by Professor McGiffert without apparently sufficient grounds. Further, so far as Luke's ignorance of primitive Christianity is concerned, it is easy to account for it in the case of a man writing in the time of Domitian, when he was of necessity dependent upon fragmentary traditions or documents; while his non-acquaintance with the biographical elements of Galatians can be accounted for by the facts that the letter was written when the author of the "we" section was not with Paul, and the probability that Luke never was in Galatia. In this connection it is worth noticing that on the assumption of the Lukan authorship, it is possible to discover almost the very day and place when Luke received his information of Paul's affairs subsequent to his leaving Troas for the first time. One cannot help feeling that Professor McGiffert has really thrown up his brief in recognizing the strength of the arguments against a second century authorship of Acts, since most of the difficulties connected with such a view are really to be found in a non-Lukan authorship in the time of Domitian. Also, the admitted literary ability of the author of Acts consorts ill with the clumsy use of the "we" section in case he did not himself write them. And is not the omission of facts from Paul's letters, in that it implies a limited circulation of those letters, in itself an argument for an early author?

While thus we are led to differ with Professor McGiffert's denial of the Lukan authorship of Acts, we are naturally in hearty agreement with his refusal to follow Weizsäcker in discrediting the book's historical value. While occasionally we cannot agree with either his rejection or his admission of materials, on the whole it is gratifying to find in the volume such a sober handling of Acts. In this particular Professor McGiffert is true to the semi-conservative movement in criticism that promises so much for historical reconstructions.

II. In the chronology of the life of Paul, Professor McGiffert is in substantial (though not by any means complete) agreement with O. Holtzmann and Harnack. The conversion of Paul is placed in 31 or 32, the Apostolic Council in 45 or 46, the second missionary journey in 46-49, the arrest of Paul in 53, his journey to Rome in 55-56, his imprisonment there in 56-58, and his death in 58. In this chronology, as will be noted presently, he also changes the succession of events as well as dates.

This chronology suggests a number of questions, two of which should be considered. First, in his date of Paul's conversion, Professor McGiffert has yielded to weighty data and brought the event back closer to the death of Jesus. There is everything in favor of such a retrogression, even if one holds (as Professor McGiffert does not) to a distinct visit to Jerusalem at the time of the famine, and a later visit described in Acts 15. There is nothing in either Acts or Galatians pointing to the lapse of several years between the death of Jesus and the conversion of Paul. On the contrary, the whole impression left by the account in Acts is that of a brief period. One query alone suggests itself. Is not more weight to be given to the chronological datum of the absence of Roman coins of Damascus between 33-62 than is allowed on page 164 *n*?

The second element of this chronology is its focal point, the succession of Festus to Felix as procurator of Judea. Professor McGiffert's argument here is very forcible, and its somewhat notable silence as to the testimony of Eusebius is no element of weakness. No one can deny that the harmonization of Josephus and Tacitus at this point is very much of a riddle—indeed is impossible if all data given by both are retained. In the two chief features in the problem—the length of the administration of Felix and the rôle of Pallas—Professor McGiffert follows Tacitus rather than Josephus. As regards the first, he acutely argues that a trace of the former governorship of Felix, mentioned by Tacitus, may be found in the acquaintance between Felix and the high priest Jonathan implied by the latter's recommendation of the former as a successor of Cumanus. Thus the events mentioned by Josephus as belonging to the procuratorship of Felix might belong to a previous official period, and might not therefore argue a long administration prior to his removal. Yet even this can hardly explain how Tacitus should represent Felix and Cumanus as co-governors and Josephus explicitly state that Felix succeeded Cumanus. It is dangerous—though nowadays not unprecedented—to assail the accuracy of the Roman historian, but his description of Cumanus as governor of Galilee while Felix was governor of Samaria and Judea certainly is not without its difficulties. Such a division of the province is unknown to Josephus, who was on the ground, and on every consideration appears highly improbable. Evidence that such a prolongation of the separate administration of the tetrachate of Herod Antipas is utterly wanting, while the whole process by which parts of it came into the possession of Agrippa II, as well as the administration of the region at the time

when Josephus attempted to organize it in rebellion against Rome, imply—though not very distinctly it must be admitted—that it was regarded as an integral part of the procuratorial district of Judea. The division given by Tacitus involves, further, an equality of rank between Felix and Cumanus. Were there, then, *two* procuratorial districts? Or were both the lieutenant-governors subject to a real procurator of whom we know nothing? Either alternative seems equally impossible, especially since the grounds given by Josephus as those on which Cumanus was removed—disorders in Judea and Samaria—argue that his administration was not restricted to Galilee and are too circumstantial to be rejected.

Mommsen, *Staatsverwaltung*, iv, 412, follows Josephus, simply referring to Tacitus in a footnote; but in *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, II, 220, he follows Tacitus but without giving his reasons. If we knew more about the Jewish toparchy it might be possible to say that Felix was in charge of one under Cumanus. In such a case it would not be difficult to explain how Tacitus fell into error, and how Jonathan became acquainted with Felix. But not only is it difficult to prove that the toparchy was administered by a Roman official, but, even if Felix had held such an office, it would hardly explain the account of Josephus and the words of Paul.

Thus, so far as the succession of Felix himself is concerned, we are led to regard Tacitus as less trustworthy than Josephus. Felix was the successor of Cumanus, and we are forced to put the events assigned his administration by Josephus immediately before his removal, though not of necessity exclusively in the reign of Nero. But whether or not partly in the reign of Claudius, these events could very well justify the “many years” of Paul.

This, it will be argued, is impossible if Felix was acquitted by the influence of Pallas. By no means. Felix might have been aided by Pallas, who we know remained rich, without the latter's being in favor with Nero, and this last is the only chronological datum in this connection that Tacitus affects. If Josephus was mistaken in regard to this mere fact of Pallas' influence, all difficulty disappears. And knowing how liable is Josephus in his zeal to find causes of events to mistake as regards them, especially in those that involve personal influence, to say nothing of the fact that the introduction of an unimportant episode like this, happening in Rome and described incidentally years after its occurrence, could hardly be based upon careful investigation, and further, remembering how liable one writing years

after the event would be to make the mistake, it can hardly appear impossible that Josephus has erred in making the success of Pallas in bringing about the acquittal of his brother depend upon the favor of Nero. Pallas was abundantly able, even after his dismissal from office, both from wealth and prestige, to accomplish such a result.

By thus following each author in matters concerning which he would be least liable to error and disregarding all others, we arrive at the following conclusions: (1) Felix succeeded Cumanus in 52 or 53. (2) His administration was filled with disorder and extended through several years. (3) After his removal from office he was accused by the Jews, whom he had sent to Rome to get the imperial decision as regards the dispute at Cæsarea, was tried, and acquitted through the influence of Pallas, although the latter was no longer in office or favor.¹

But, there are also difficulties involved in the very data upon which Professor McGiffert bases the date of the recall of Felix. According to Tacitus (*Ann.* 13:14) Pallas was disgraced before the fourteenth birthday of Britannicus, *i. e.*, February 13, 55. But it is clear that Paul's departure for Rome was shortly after the accession of Festus, and just before winter. Both of these events, therefore, since in this view they preceded the fall of Pallas, must have occurred between the autumn of 54 and February 55. But, we can be more explicit. Nero came to the throne on October 13, 54. Between October 13, 54, and February 13, 55, must be placed the removal of Felix, the appointment of Festus by Nero (*Ant.* 20:8:9), his journey to Cæsarea, the journey of Felix to Rome, his trial and acquittal, and the fall of Pallas. The difficulty of crowding all these events into four months is apparent. Harnack, therefore, aided somewhat by Eusebius, has attempted to make the fall of Pallas in 56 rather than 55. This would obviate the difficulty were it not for the fact that Tacitus did not, as Harnack conjectures, mean the fifteenth birthday of Britannicus when he said "fourteenth," for he gives the names of the consuls. (See Ramsay's article in *Expositor*, March 1897.) Professor McGiffert also avoids the difficulty, but by overlooking the specific data of Tacitus, simply saying that Pallas "was relieved of his offices before the end of the year 55," and that "Nero ascended the throne too late in the previous year to send Festus to Palestine before the early fall, when Paul was dispatched to Rome" (p. 357).

¹ This is on the basis largely of the account of *Antiquities* (20:8:9). According to the *Jewish War* (2:13:7) Felix had sent the embassy himself, and a decision in the question involved was not reached until the outbreak of the great revolution in 66

It will perhaps appear as a consequence of our position that all chronological data have vanished. And it is true that one can no longer base the chronology of an apostle's life upon the dismissal of an imperial favorite, but none the less chronological data remain, more certain if less exact than those rejected. The successor of Festus, Albinus, was procurator shortly after the Feast of Tabernacles, four years before the outbreak of the Jewish war (*Jewish War* 6:5:3) which occurred in the twelfth year of Nero (*Jewish War* 2:14:4). That is, Albinus was already procurator in 62. How long he may have been in office it is impossible to say, but more probably from the summer of that year at the latest, and there is nothing in the context to forbid one making it earlier. It is evident from *Ant.* 20:9:1 that a period of at least three months elapsed between the death of Festus and the accession of Albinus, and it is therefore altogether probable that Festus died not later than in the winter of 61-62. The events of his administration include an embassy to Rome, a decision by Nero, the return of the embassy just about the time of the death of Festus, as well as other events requiring considerable time. It is therefore impossible to allow less time than one year (and portions of two would probably be more correct) for their occurrence. This brings the accession of Festus back to 59-61, and a corresponding date for the departure of Paul to Rome with the probabilities pointing towards 60—or that date which is commonly accepted. It should be noted in passing that this brings events into harmony with *Ant.* 20:8:11, when Poppea, "Nero's wife," is said to have brought about the release of ten of the Jewish ambassadors. Now, Poppea's influence began in 58 (Tacitus; *Ann.* 13:45, 46) and her marriage was in 62 (*Ann.* 14:60).

The advantages of this computation over that of Professor McGiffert and others who put the accession of Festus in 55 or 56 is this: it proceeds from definite chronological statements of Josephus and does not depend upon a sentence, or rather clause, introduced without the slightest chronological intent into a passage which, as has appeared above, is full of uncertainties, and from which it is by no means

(2:14:4). Such inconsistencies, though not beyond adjustment, strengthen the suspicion of the accuracy of the details given in the *Antiquities*. For the truth of the statements of the *Jewish War* is implied in *Ant.* 20:8:9 when the decision of the emperor obtained by Burrhus is said to have resulted in the revolution. If the acquittal of Felix was contemporaneous with the rendering of this decision in 66, the whole statement as to the influence of Pallas is to be rejected, for he was put to death in 62. Yet it is possible that although his fate was involved in the case on trial, the influence of Pallas was sufficient to bring it to a speedier decision.

impossible to infer that the clause upon which the entire chronology depends is utterly untrue. It further does not involve one in the difficulties resulting from a comparison of Tacitus and Josephus, and gives a legitimate meaning to Paul's characterization of the length of the administration of Felix without summoning the aid of a purely conjectural assignment of events to an official career which itself may never have existed. Unless his discussion has utterly escaped our notice, Professor McGiffert makes no use of these specific chronological data of Josephus. This is to be regretted not alone on the grounds of incompleteness of induction, but also from the desire one feels of learning how on his hypothesis he would divide the time between 55 and 62.

III. In the harmonization of Acts and Galatians, Professor McGiffert has cut the Gordian knot by identifying all three accounts in Acts 11, 15 and Gal. 2. The basis for this position is that (p. 171) "it is entirely conceivable that Luke found two independent accounts of the same journey in his sources; and as the occasion was given differently in the two cases, he supposed them to refer to separate events, and inserted them at what seemed to him the proper points in his narrative." Professor McGiffert admits there are difficulties in assuming that the two accounts refer to the same visit, but Gal. 2 : 1-10 (which "must be insisted upon as certain" to refer to the same time as Acts 15 : 1 *sq.*, p. 209 *n*) seems to imply the double purpose of providing for the poor, and for Gentile Christianity. This is certainly an easy way of settling the matter, and such an assignment is in accord with the author's chronology of Paul's life. Nor can it be denied that there are traces of different sources at this point in Acts which may lend color to this critical hypothesis. But without further evidence than that adduced, such a solution of the very great difficulties presented by the relations of Acts to Galatians can hardly be regarded as removing the purely historical objections to the identification. Such a harmonization combines all the difficulties of that suggested by Professor Ramsay and that commonly accepted with others arising from the theory as to the composition of Acts involved in the critical position.

But having thus accomplished the identification, Professor McGiffert is led into an order of events which, if indeed consistent, is none the less difficult to accept. Chief among the changes this order necessitates is the making of Galatians the first of Paul's epistles, written before his second missionary journey in 46. The chief grounds

for such a location of the letter are two (p. 227): (1) On the South Galatian theory (which, as we should expect, Professor McGiffert accepts) Paul had visited the churches in Antioch, Iconium, and Lystra twice on his first missionary tour. If the letter was written after his second missionary tour, he must have visited them three times before writing the letter—a view contradicted by Gal. 4: 13. (2) If Paul had seen the Galatian Christians between the apostolic conference and the writing of the letter, it is difficult to see why he should recount the doings of that conference. For it is incredible that he should have seen the Galatians and not have warned them against the Judaizers. Corroborating facts are discovered (pp. 227, 228) (1) in the evidently inceptive activity of the Judaizers, (2) in the quickness of the Galatian's defection, (3) in the brief interval between the visits of 4: 13, (4) in the absence of personal greetings from Paul's companions, (5) in the fact that in none of his other epistles there is evidence that Judaizers were giving Paul trouble, implies a victory at this time, before he had begun preaching in Asia, whither he went forewarned and forearmed.

Several of these arguments, especially (5), are open to question, but apart from the harmonization of Acts and Galatians, they all depend upon the *τὸ πρότερον* visit of Gal. 4: 13, which Professor McGiffert thinks occurred upon the eastward journey on the first missionary tour, the second visit being on his westward journey from Derbe. It cannot be denied that such a view is possible, but on the whole it hardly seems probable. Paul cannot be said to have visited Derbe twice on the first tour, and his letter is addressed to the churches of Galatia, not to those of the cities Professor McGiffert cites. And even if this argument be regarded as belittling the matter, one cannot escape the conviction that Paul, in the entire epistle, is thinking of his stay in the province as a whole and not in the separate cities, and also that the author of Acts regards the stops made by Paul on the return from Derbe as mere incidents in one general visit to the province—a combination of Gal. 4: 13 and Acts, with which, singularly enough, Professor McGiffert seems inadvertently to agree on pp. 191 and 192 *n.* Further, on the hypothesis that Galatians was thus written before the second missionary journey, the account of Timothy's circumcision is extraordinary, to say the least, and Professor McGiffert, on this ground, rejects as untrue the account of the affair in Acts 16: 3, holding that Timothy was indeed circumcised, but that tradition has erred in accrediting the act to Paul (p. 234). But is this not rather a severe strain to put upon a view that rests finally upon such an indefinite datum as an interpre-

tation of τὸ πρότερον? It certainly makes unintelligible such passages as Gal. 1:10 and 5:11, which are wonderfully apposite if Paul's circumcision of Timothy as a part of his ingenuous being all things to all men had given ground for the charges these verses combat. Indeed it is hard to see how other portions of Galatians could ever have been written if Paul had not given a basis for charges precisely such as the circumcision of Timothy would have suggested. If Titus had been circumcised at Jerusalem, the need of the Acts' account of Timothy as an explanation of Galatians would be weakened, but Professor McGiffert rejects such an explanation of the troublesome passage in Gal. 2:3-5 (p. 196). And as to tradition's having made Paul perform the deed Timothy's parents or friends had already accomplished, one cannot help thinking that such a supposition is highly improbable, not only since Acts was written in the days of Domitian, but also from its total lack of motive. A Paulinist—even in the limited sense in which Professor McGiffert regards the author of Acts (p. 463)—or a semi-Pauline Christianity could hardly be expected to produce the story to support an outgrown short-lived anti-Paulinism—especially if, as Professor McGiffert, in accounting for the absence of controversy over Judaism in non-canonical Christian literature, expressly says (p. 443), “that Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, were entirely free from the obligation to observe the law of Moses, simply went without saying in most parts of Christendom, even before the time of Paul's death, and there was no reason whatever for a Christian writer to spend either time or thought upon a question that concerned neither himself nor his brethren.” In leaving this subject, reference might, perhaps, be made to another, though relatively insignificant matter. Professor McGiffert accepts Professor Ramsay's suggestion that Paul's “thorn in the flesh” was malarial fever that overcame him at Perga (p. 177); that is, apparently, in 42 (p. 319*n*). The revelation which occurred fourteen years before 2 Corinthians (12:1-9) was written, would, therefore, have occurred in 38 or 39, that is, three or four years before the “thorn,” which was intended to offset the glory of the revelation, was given. Professor McGiffert dismisses the difficulty (p. 319*n*) with the remark that “Paul's words do not necessarily imply that the ‘thorn in the flesh’ was given him immediately after he had received his revelation.” On the current chronology no such difficulty arises, and the passage in 2 Corinthians may be taken in its obvious sense.

IV. In treating of the last years of Paul, Professor McGiffert has given what, in many particulars, one is tempted to call the strongest

part of his work. It would be difficult to find a clearer piece of criticism than that which deals with the pastoral epistles, or a better piece of constructive history than that based upon the results of such criticism — unless, indeed, it be the author's similar work with others of Paul's letters. The distinctness of treatment in these matters is probably due to the fact that here much better than in the author's treatment of Acts, generally admirable as it is, the reader is put more completely in possession of the critical process by which the author has reached his results. And yet one hesitates at some of the conclusions this criticism reaches — one might say, just because of the distinctness of the method. For one fears lest possibly some discordant datum, like those which have been so generally introduced in other portions of the volume, may have escaped notice. Thus one feels that the conjecture as to Peter's life in Rome (p. 591 *sq.*), though very attractive, in that it depends so largely upon a chronology we hesitate to accept is no more beyond question than the death of Paul in 58. What of the tradition that the two suffered martyrdom together, as is at least implied by Clement of Rome? Or at about the same time, as we find expressly stated in the very passage quoted by Eusebius (ii, 25) from Dionysius, which Professor McGiffert uses in proving Peter's martyrdom under Nero (p. 592 *n*)? And it is difficult to see why the words of Clement, "gathered unto Peter and Paul," used (p. 592) by Professor McGiffert in proving the same date, do not prove it as well for Paul's as for Peter's death. Similarly, also, the statement of Irenæus (*Adv. Haer.* 3: 1: 1) that Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel and founding the church in Rome, can as fairly be used to prove the coworking of Paul and Peter in Rome as to prove (p. 569 *n*) that the Logia were written in Hebrew (Aramaic) not long before 70 (p. 570), and that Peter visited Rome (p. 591). And is it not a fair question whether, in the light of Irenæus, this date of the Logia is not somewhat inconsistent with Peter's (to say nothing of Paul's having been present at the same time) having been in Rome 58–64? Here again there is no difficulty in using all data if the chronology of Paul's life be not pushed back because of Josephus's incidental statement as to Pallas.

But although Paul may not have been put to death in 58, it is still an open question as to whether or not Professor McGiffert may not be correct in holding that the abrupt close of Acts is due to the fact that Paul was never released, but met his death at the end of the two years there mentioned (pp. 417–419). Of course if one holds to the genu-

iness of the pastoral epistles as they now stand, the question is not an open one. On their testimony we can conclude only that Paul was released and was engaged on a fourth missionary journey when arrested. But in the light of modern scholarship, until the integrity and Pauline authorship of these epistles have been established, it is much safer to regard the question of this possible release as an element in the other problem and to treat it independently. And thus treated, it cannot be denied that there is much to favor the view that Acts closes with the close of Paul's life. It would indeed be difficult to see any reason for ending the account of his relations with the Romans at this point if he and Christianity had experienced such a pronounced endorsement as an acquittal at the imperial court, if Professor Ramsay with precisely the same view as to the purpose of the book of Acts — the one great ground upon which both decisions are based — had not arrived at precisely the opposite view! And his arguments are very weighty. Yet if the author's view as regards the pastoral epistles (p. 673) — viz., that they are a reworking of genuine letters of Paul written in 51-52, which may be recovered by criticism (pp. 408, 409 *sq.*) — were once admitted, although he has not given (pp. 415*n*, 416*n*, 418*n*) quite the consideration to Spitta's argument for a continuance of Paul's missionary activities we should have expected (those of Harnack not being at his disposal), there would be fewer grounds for doubting the correctness of his position. If the relations of Peter to the Roman church and Paul could be brought into harmony with the earlier date of Paul's death, this position would be considerably strengthened. But these relations can be explained quite as satisfactorily when the current chronology, and the arguments for the later missionary work of Paul, independent of the pastoral epistles, are considerable and important.

V. Taken altogether, therefore, one hesitates to yield assent to most of the changes in apostolic chronology proposed by Professor McGiffert, although the strength of his positions is at time very great. But while having thus considered what appear the most characteristic portions of the book, we cannot omit noticing several less prominent matters of detail. (1) Professor McGiffert's treatment of the movement that gave rise to the death of Stephen is not altogether what we should have expected from the statement of his preface in regard to Weizsäcker. May it not be possible that Stephen was at the head of a sort of Pauline movement before Paul, and that this was the real cause of the bitterness showed towards him and his friends by the Jews? Pro-

fessor McGiffert's interpretation of Stephen's speech (pp. 86-89) fails to disprove that Stephen admitted the charge brought against him and proceeded to justify his position by showing that Jehovah had always been worshiped in temples not made by hands. Indeed, we venture to think, his interpretation can hardly be said to harmonize the fact that persons like those scattered by the first persecution should have found it natural to preach to Gentiles (p. 108 *n*) if they had had only Judaism to preach (p. 58, *cf.* pp. 86 and 108). The possibility of a liberal tendency among certain Hellenists in Jerusalem admitted by Professor McGiffert (p. 85), in the light of Stephen's speech and the sudden fury of the Pharisees against the church (or more likely a portion of the church, since the Apostles were apparently not involved) to say nothing of other subsequent events, seems to favor a cumulative argument of no small weight in favor of the position that Paul was in a sense a continuer of Stephen's work, and that his "gospel" had been in a measure anticipated by the Stephen-party. (2) Professor McGiffert's treatment of certain other topics connected with the life of Paul is most satisfactory. Thus, his discussion as to the distinction between a Jewish Christian's eating with Gentile Christians and acknowledging their conversion (pp. 104-6); his presentation of Paul's doctrine as to righteousness (pp. 142 *sq.*)—a discussion, by the way, distinctly superior to his introductory statement as to the teaching of Jesus; his refusal to be led off into the tempting but superficial view of Matheson as to the "development" of Paul's gospel (p. 163); his reconstruction of the period between 1 and 2 Corinthians (pp. 290 *sq.*) although one might differ from certain positions; his refusal to follow an ingenious essay into the assertion of a Pauline origin for the Lord's Supper (pp. 68 *n*, 536) although Paul may have made of it a separate meal (p. 538); his explanation of Paul's appeal to Cæsar (p. 354 *n*); his general estimate of Paul and his work (pp. 422-423, 440-445); his summary statements of the contents of the various epistles—although it is a fair question whether or not in following his belief in a Gentile destiny of the epistle to the Hebrews he has not minimized its teaching as to the priestly character of Christ (pp. 471-472); his acute discrimination between Pauline teaching and early Gentile Christianity (ch. 5), although in this connection his statements as to the non-Pauline character of the synoptic gospels seem somewhat too strong (p. 462). (3) There is space left for barely mentioning some of Professor McGiffert's positions on questions now under investigation. 1 Peter he regards as the work of a Paulinist (possibly Barnabas) who,

better than any author of the early church had grasped the real heart of Paul's teaching (pp. 482-487). The fourth gospel was produced under the indirect influence of Paul, although its discourse (like some of Paul's own teachings are to be traced back to some word of Jesus himself (pp. 491, 492), for the gospel could have come only from one who had himself known Jesus, or had learned of him first from one of his own disciples (p. 493). Christianity made its way among the masses because they were told that they were children of God (p. 513)—although one wonders in the light of apparently opposing statements made on p. 508 just how far this statement is intended to be taken as objectively historical. All of the Pauline epistles (except the pastoral, and they in part) are genuine. Hebrews, like 1 Peter, is the work of a Paulinist who is unknown. The letter was therefore not written by Barnabas (p. 598). 1 John was written by the author of the fourth gospel, who though a Hebrew was not necessarily the apostle (p. 614). The gospel, however, is shown by recent criticism to contain a large body of genuine apostolic matter, and very possibly as it stands is the work of one of John's disciples (p. 616). 2 and 3 John if not the work of this disciple (p. 620), were certainly from the same school. The Apocalypse was written during the persecution of Domitian (p. 634) but not by the author of the fourth gospel. The utmost that can be said of its author is that "he was a Christian prophet of Jewish birth but of universalistic principles, whose name was John and who resided in Asia," who knew and was known by the churches in Asia (p. 623), and was, if not the apostle John, probably the presbyter John (p. 624). This John made large use of earlier sources although Professor McGiffert, with a non-committal reference to Professor Briggs' "careful and elaborate analysis," declines to be drawn into the discussion as to what and whence the sources were (p. 633 *n*). The epistles of James and Jude though not pseudonymous were not written by the brothers of Jesus, but by some unknown persons toward the end of the first century (p. 580 *sq.*). 2 Peter is pseudonymous and dates from the middle of the second century (p. 602).

It is impossible to consider the innumerable other questions handled by this work. A careful examination, however, will show that while Professor McGiffert has omitted the discussion of certain details (*e. g.*, in case of Paul's visit to Philippi), he has seldom or never avoided questions because of purely critical difficulties, but has given with singular conciseness and completeness the arguments which support the view he holds. If it sometimes may appear that he

has been less concerned to give the grounds for an opposite opinion, it can well be replied that to do this fully would be to swell his work beyond limits.

In closing, a word of regret should be added that the volume contains no index of texts, and another of appreciation for the excellent bibliographies invariably attached to discussions.